

## TMA-DOUBLING IN SCANDINAVIAN ANNA-LENA WIKLUND

Variants of spoken Swedish, Norwegian, Danish and Faroese allow doubling of verbal morphology under restricted class of matrix verbs. For the purpose of the present paper, we refer to the phenomenon as Tense-/ Mood-/ Aspect-doubling, or TMA-doubling for short. The Swedish sentences in (1) exemplify tense-doubling (past), mood-doubling (imperative), and aspect-doubling (past participial), respectively.

- (1) a. Han försökte [o skrev].  
he try.PAST and write.PAST  
'He tried to write.'  
b. Försök [o skriv]!  
try.IMP and write.IMP  
'Try to write!'  
c. Han hade kunnat [skrivit].  
he had can.PPC write.PPC  
'He had been able to write.'

The complementizer *o(ch)* introducing the embedded clause in (1a) and (1b) is homophonous to the conjunction element *o(ch)* 'and'. This element appears under verbs that select a complementizer (*o(ch)* or *att*) in the standard infinitival counterparts of the doubling construction, cf (2).

- (2) a. Han försökte [o/att skriva].  
he try.PAST and/to write.INF  
'He tried to write.'  
b. Försök [o/att skriva]!  
try.IMP and/to write.INF  
'Try to write!'  
c. Han hadekunnat [skriva]  
he had can.PPC write.INF  
'He had been able to write.'

We will show that:

1. TMA-doubling involves multiple spell-out of one set of features shared between two clauses.
  2. The structures associated with the sentences in (1) differ subtly from those associated with the sentences in (2)
  3. Variation is restricted.
1. The sentences in (1) above share the truth conditions with the infinitival counterparts in (2) used in standard language. The duplicated morphology is therefore semantically vacuous; a reflex of dependencies between the matrix and embedded clause.
  2. Even though truth conditions are shared between (1) and (2), there are subtle syntactic differences between the two constructions, suggesting that the dependencies that yield morphological doubling in (1) are not (necessarily) present in (2).
  3. There is variation with regard to the set of matrix verbs that are capable of doubling, as well as with regard to the set of forms that may duplicate. However, speakers appear to agree that doubling is dispreferred or impossible (i) into islands (e.g. into the complement clause of a noun), (ii) in non-local environments (across a

verb that does not itself carry duplicated morphology), and (iii) in tensed environments (e.g. into a clause with a future-oriented temporal orientation). The third restriction naturally adds a limit to the set of matrix verbs that may participate in TMA-doubling constructions. For speakers where doubling is less restricted with respect to forms that may duplicate, it can be shown that there is a correlation between the amount of embedded structure and number of forms that may duplicate: the more structure there is in the embedded clause, the more forms may duplicate. In certain contexts, therefore, forms that may duplicate are restricted even for speakers that are otherwise 'liberal' in this respect.